

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Final Office Action dated July 9, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance is requested.

Claims 23, 25, 26, 28, 32, 34, 46, 49-50, and 53-55 remain in this application.

Claims 1-22, 24, 27, 29-31, 33, 35-45, 47-48, and 51-52 were previously canceled. Claims 53-55 are new claims added by this amendment.

Support for new claims 53-55 can be found throughout the originally filed specification and particularly in paragraph [0041] of the originally filed specification.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 103

In the Office Action, claims 23, 25, 26, 28, 32, 34, 46, 49, and 50 where rejected under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Obayashi et al (US 4,749,625) view of Mollet et al. (US 4,785,136). In rejecting the claims, the Office Action acknowledged that the teachings of Obayashi did not disclose all of the claimed limitations. However, the Office Action rejected the claims by combining the teachings of Mollet with Obayashi and arguing that

Mollet et al discloses thermoformed shape substrate (40) being shaped to having an enclosure for enclosing an electronic component (Fig 4) comprising an inner surface, an outer surface, edges, a first surface (34), a plurality of sidewalls having a first end and a second end, the first end of each of the sidewalls are coupled to the first surface, wherein the sidewalls extend to an angle from the first surface, wherein the first surface and sidewalls define an enclosure portion (Fig 4), a peripheral flange (28) coupled to the second end of the sidewalls that extend around [t]he enclosure portion.

The Applicant respectfully traverses. According to MPEP §2143, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the prior art reference

must teach or suggest all the claims limitations. Moreover, according to *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974) and MPEP 2143.03, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. The Applicant believes that neither Obayashi nor Mollet teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations.

Specifically, the claims recite that the shaped polymer substrate or material is "shaped to have an enclosure for enclosing an electronic component." Neither Obayashi nor Mollet disclose this limitation. The Office Action has already acknowledged that Obayashi does not teach this limitation. However, contrary to the Office Action the Applicant believes that Mollet also fails to teach a shaped polymer substrate or material that is shaped to have an enclosure for enclosing an electronic component. In the claims, the shaped polymer substrate is a metallized polymer substrate and it is this metallized polymer substrate that forms the enclosure. Mollet teaches forming an enclosure with "a rigid sheet 20" that is backed with a conductive fabric 24 bonded or the like to one side of said plastic sheet 20. (*See Mollet col. 4 lines 40-42*). The rigid sheet 20 that is backed with a conductive fabric 24 is not a metallized polymer substrate. Obayashi also fails to teach a shaped polymer substrate, as recited in the claims. Instead, Obayashi is directed at an amorphous metal laminate sheet which is different than the shaped substrate. The claims specifically recite a shaped polymer substrate and the coatings which are formed on the shaped polymer substrate. Obayashi fails to disclose anything that resembles a shaped polymer substrate. Therefore, neither Mollet nor Obayashi disclose "the shaped polymer substrate is shaped to have an enclosure for enclosing an electronic component," as recited in the claims.

Nevertheless, in an effort to expedite prosecution and further distinguish all the claims from the cited references, the Applicants have amended the claims to recite that at least one surface of the shaped polymer substrate has been modified to increase surface tension of the shaped polymer substrate. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the originally filed specification including paragraph [0041] of the originally filed application. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the claims in light of these arguments and amendments.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jesus Del Castillo/

Jesus Del Castillo
Reg. No. 51,604

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
JDC:gis
61196196 v1